

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

14cv0111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

PARROT S.A., PARROT, INC.,
Defendants.

ORDER OF COURT RE: DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL THE 30(B)(6)
DEPOSITION OF DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND THE DEPOSITIONS OF MR.
BRUCE DING AND MS. DIANE LEE (DOC. NO. 72)

Presently before this Court is Defendants' Motion to Compel the Depositions of Bruce Ding and Diane Lee, who are Plaintiff's sole employee and the named inventor of the patents-in-suit, respectively. Doc. Nos. 72 and 73. Ding and Lee are husband and wife. As ordered, Plaintiff has filed a response to Defendants' Motion to Compel. Doc. No. 76. Plaintiff opposed Defendants' Motion. Since the Parties were at an impasse as to what is normally a routine discovery issue, the Court ordered Counsel to meet and confer at 9:00AM on August 19, 2014, in an attempt to resolve their dispute. 08/14/14 Text Order. The Court informed Counsel that if they did not resolve the dispute, a hearing on the matter would be held that same morning at 10:00AM.

Counsel for the Parties met this morning and were unable to fully resolve this matter. The Parties reached agreement as to the location of the depositions and additional videotaping of the depositions. Agreement was not reached on three issues. Thereafter, the Court held a hearing and heard argument on the matters that were still in dispute. After hearing argument from the Parties during this hearing and based upon the previously filed briefs, the following Order is entered:

AND NOW, this 19th day of August, 2014, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Defendants' Motion to Compel the 30(b)(6) Deposition of Drone Technologies, Inc. and the Depositions of Mr. Bruce Ding and Ms. Diane Lee (Doc. No. 72) is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART AS FOLLOWS:**
 - A. As agreed to by the Parties, the depositions will occur at a conference room at the Howard Plaza Hotel Taipei, the Park Taipei Hotel or the Shangri-La's Far Eastern Plaza Hotel, Taipei (or other agreed-upon location subject to availability);
 - B. As agreed to by the Parties, Plaintiff may make arrangements to video record the depositions. This video would be in addition to the main video camera, which will be trained on the deponent. The second video camera will be trained on the examining attorney and will be taken at Plaintiff's expense. Plaintiff shall provide a copy of the video to Defendants. The copy of the video is not admissible in Court; only the main video may be admissible;
 - C. The schedule of the depositions shall be:
 - i. September 10, 2014: 30(b)(6) deposition of Bruce Ding;
 - ii. September 11, 2014: individual deposition of Bruce Ding. Ding's individual deposition shall not include any questions asked during Ding's 30(b)(6) deposition; and
 - iii. September 12, 2014: deposition of Diane Lee
- D. Absent Lee's (or her agent's) prior written consent, none of the information gained during the deposition (including the transcript) can be used in any other litigation, including the California state court case that Parrot S.A. filed against Lee on July 14, 2014; and
- E. No service of a summons, subpoena, or complaint, or service of any other kind may be made upon Lee by Defendants or their agents while in Taiwan.

s/ Arthur J. Schwab

Arthur J. Schwab

United States District Judge

cc: All Registered ECF Counsel and Parties